

IPM

Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program

Northeastern Region

FY 2007 Request for Applications

Due Dates:

Letter of Intent: Friday, October 6, 2006

Application: Friday, November 17, 2006

Grants.gov program code: QQ.NE
Program code name: Northeastern IPM



U.S. Department of Agriculture



Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service

FEDERALLY SPONSORED COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

REGIONAL INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT COMPETITIVE GRANTS PROGRAM — NORTHEASTERN REGION

INITIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE: Projects awarded under Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, ch. 79, 38 Stat. 372, 7 U.S.C. 341 et seq. can be found in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under 10.500. Projects awarded under Section 2(c)(1)(B) of the Act of August 4, 1965, Public Law No. 89-106, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i (c)(1)(B)) can be found in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under 10.200.

DATES: A letter of intent to submit an application must be received by John Ayers, the NE-IPM Grants Manager, by close of business (COB) on October 6, 2006 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time) in order to submit an application for consideration. An application will not be accepted if a letter of intent was not submitted in accordance with instructions in this Request for Applications (RFA). Applications must be received by Grants.gov by COB on November 17, 2006 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time). Applications received after this deadline will normally not be considered for funding. Comments regarding this RFA are requested within six months from the issuance of this notice. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

STAKEHOLDER INPUT: The Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES), USDA is requesting comments regarding this RFA from any interested party. These comments will be considered in the development of the next RFA for the program, if applicable, and will be used to meet the requirements of section 103(c)(2) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7613(c)(2)). This section requires the Secretary to solicit and consider input on a current RFA from persons who conduct or use agricultural research, education and extension for use in formulating future RFAs for competitive programs. Written stakeholder comments on this RFA should be submitted in accordance with the deadline set forth in the DATES portion of this Notice.

Written stakeholder comments should be submitted by mail to: Policy, Oversight, and Funds Management Branch; Office of Extramural Programs; CSREES-USDA; STOP 2299; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, DC 20250-2299; or via e-mail to: RFP-OEP@csrees.usda.gov. (This e-mail address is intended only for receiving comments regarding this RFA and not for requesting information or forms.) In your comments, please state that you are responding to the fiscal year (FY) 2007 Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program RFA for the Northeastern Region.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: CSREES requests applications for the Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program for FY 2007 to support the continuum of research and extension efforts needed to increase the implementation of integrated pest management (IPM) methods. The Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program supports projects that develop individual pest control tactics, integrate individual tactics into an IPM system, and develop and

implement extension education programs. The program is administered by the land-grant university system's four regional IPM Centers (North Central, Northeastern, Southern, Western) in partnership with CSREES. In FY 2007, CSREES anticipates that approximately \$610,000 will be available for support of the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program – Northeastern Region (referred to herein as the NE-IPM Competitive Grants Program). Of this amount, approximately \$365,000 is expected to be available for Research projects, \$70,000 for Extension projects, and \$175,000 for Joint Research-Extension projects.

For a comparison of the Northeastern IPM Center's grants programs, and details about previously funded projects, please see http://northeastipm.org/about_fund.cfm.

This notice identifies the objectives for NE-IPM Competitive Grants Program projects, the eligibility criteria for projects and applicants, and the application forms and associated instructions needed to apply for a grant through this program. **For FY 2007, all proposals must be submitted electronically through Grants.gov. See Part IV for details.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I—FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

A. Legislative Authority and Background	5
B. Priorities and Requirements	5

PART II—AWARD INFORMATION

A. Available Funding	8
B. Types of Applications	8
C. Project Types	8

PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants	11
B. Cost Sharing or Matching	11

PART IV—APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

A. The Application Package	12
B. Content and Form of Letter of Intent and Application Submission	12
C. Submission Dates and Times	19
D. Funding Restrictions	19
E. Other Submission Requirements	19

PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

A. General	20
B. Evaluation Criteria	20
C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality	22
D. Organizational Management Information	23

PART VI—AWARD ADMINISTRATION

A. General	24
B. Award Notice	24
C. Administrative and National Policy Requirements	25
D. Expected Program Outputs and Reporting Requirements	26

PART VII—[PROGRAM CONTACT](#).....

PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION

A. Access to Review Information	28
B. Use of Funds; Changes	28
C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards	29
D. Regulatory Information	29
E. Definitions	29
F. CSREES' Grants.gov Implementation Plans	30
G. DUNS Number	31
H. Required Registration for Grants.gov	31

PART I—FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

A. Legislative Authority and Background

Authority for the funding of Research projects is contained in Section 2(c)(1)(B) of the Act of August 4, 1965, Public Law No. 89-106, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i (c)(1)(B)). Authority for the funding of Extension projects is contained in Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, ch. 79, 38 Stat. 372, 7 U.S.C. 341 et seq. For Joint Research-Extension applications (see Part II.C.3), separate awards will be executed for P.L. 89-106 and Smith-Lever funds.

The Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program supports the continuum of research and extension efforts needed to increase the implementation of IPM methods. The Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program supports projects that develop individual pest control tactics, integrate individual tactics into an IPM system, and develop and implement extension and education programs. The program is administered by the land-grant university system's four regional IPM Centers (North Central, Northeastern, Southern, Western) in partnership with CSREES.

The goal of the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program is to provide knowledge and information needed for the implementation of IPM methods that:

- (1) improve the economic benefits related to the adoption of IPM practices;
- (2) reduce potential human health risks from pests and the use of pest management practices;
and
- (3) reduce unreasonable adverse environmental effects from pests and the use of pest management practices.

The program helps achieve this goal by increasing the supply of and dissemination of IPM knowledge and by enhancing collaboration among stakeholders. Because the specific needs of each region vary, regional program priorities will vary.

For a comparison of the Northeastern IPM Center's grants programs, and details about previously funded projects, please see http://northeastipm.org/about_fund.cfm.

B. Priorities and Requirements

The Northeastern IPM Center administers the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program — Northeastern Region (NE-IPM Competitive Grants Program), which supports research and extension projects to develop and implement new or improved IPM tactics and systems. Applications must address priorities 1, 2, and 3 directly below (see the rating sheets in Parts V.B.1 and V.B.2 for their relative importance).

1. Stakeholder-Identified Priorities

Diverse pest management stakeholders in the Northeast (such as growers, service providers, and extension educators) have developed lists of IPM needs for the region. Your application must cite and address at least one source of stakeholder-identified priorities.

Links to many of these sources of stakeholder-identified priorities are presented on the Northeastern IPM Center's website at <http://northeastipm.org/regional.cfm>. The sources include but are not limited to:

- (a) IPM Working Group priorities;
- (b) priorities stated in pest management strategic plans;
- (c) recommendations from stakeholder groups, such as the Northeast Research, Extension, and Academic Program Committee for Integrated Pest Management (NEREAP-IPM);
- (d) other documented needs-assessment evaluations.

2. Benefit to the Northeastern Region

Your application must fulfill (a) and *either* (b) or (c).

- (a) The IPM project will benefit more than one state in the Northeast (Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia).

AND

- (b) The IPM project focuses on a crop or cropping system of importance to the Northeast. (For data on crop value as it pertains to the Northeastern Region, see http://northeastipm.org/research_profiles.cfm).

OR

- (c) The IPM project focuses on managing a pest or pest complex of importance to the Northeast. Projects involving urban and community IPM (schools, parks, apartments, residential settings, and municipal buildings) are encouraged.

Benefit to the region is solidified and strengthened by **collaborations among state programs and agencies**. Collaborations, while sometimes labor-intensive to establish, can ultimately save time and resources for the parties involved. Most applications will be strengthened by fulfilling (d) or (e), below. Applicants requesting relatively small budgets (\$20,000 or less), however, will not be penalized if they cannot show multi-state or multi-institutional collaborations.

- (d) The project involves paid or unpaid collaborations with individuals or organizations in at least one state *other than* the state of the Project Director.

- (e) The project shows intended partnerships with grower organizations, industries, agencies, and programs, especially those spanning several states (e.g., NRCS, APHIS, NPDN; see http://northeastipm.org/partners_links.cfm for more details).

3. Environmental Stewardship and Likelihood of Success

The NE-IPM Competitive Grants Program supports work that:

- (a) significantly enhances and protects environmental quality and reduces the risk of health and other problems associated with pest management;
- (b) investigates, develops, promotes, or implements nonpesticidal tactics, including economical management of pest populations and interdisciplinary solutions;
- (c) is likely to be implemented—either at the producer level across a cropping system or at the community level—because of its economical advantages, benefits to the environment and human health, or other advantages.

Applications must reflect these priorities.

PART II—AWARD INFORMATION

A. Available Funding

There is no commitment by USDA to fund any particular application or to make a specific number of awards. In FY 2007, approximately \$610,000 is expected to be available to fund applications to the NE-IPM Competitive Grants Program. Of this amount, approximately \$365,000 is expected to be available for Research projects; \$70,000 for Extension projects; and \$175,000 for Joint Research-Extension projects. Individual grant duration and maximum fund availability depend on the project type and the degree of collaboration among states in the Northeastern Region (see Part II.C, Project Types, for more information).

B. Types of Applications

In FY 2007, NE-IPM Competitive Grants Program applications may be submitted as one of the following types of requests.

1. New Application

This is a project application that has not been previously submitted to the NE-IPM Competitive Grants Program. All new applications will be reviewed competitively using the selection process and evaluation criteria described in Part V.

2. Renewal Application

This is a project application that requests additional funding for a project beyond the period approved in an original or amended award. Renewal applications must be received by the application due date, will be evaluated in competition with other pending applications in appropriate areas to which they are assigned, and will be reviewed according to the same evaluation criteria as new applications.

C. Project Types

The Northeastern IPM Center, on behalf of the NE-IPM Competitive Grants Program, solicits applications for the following types of projects in FY 2007. ***You must explicitly indicate the type of project you are proposing in two places on your application: on the Relevance Statement and on the Project Summary.***

1. Research

This funding category develops the research base needed for the construction of comprehensive pest management systems that have a strong likelihood of contributing to ongoing IPM implementation efforts. You may develop individual tactics needed for pest management systems (e.g., biocontrol, cultural control, host resistance) or help increase our understanding of how interactions among tactics alter the effectiveness of pest management within agricultural, forest, suburban, and urban ecosystems. Where appropriate, the experimental approach should

emphasize field-scale experiments spanning multiple seasons or locations. Practices should be designed to reduce initial pest populations, lower the carrying capacity of the ecosystem for pests, or increase tolerance of hosts to pest injury. Long-term fundamental research is not appropriate for funding.

Research involving chemical pesticides should be designed to reduce the amount and frequency and to increase the selectivity of a pesticide application in order to minimize adverse impacts on beneficial organisms and limit buildup of pest populations that are resistant to pesticides. Applications should clearly demonstrate how the tactic or IPM system, once developed, can be incorporated into an existing production system. Projects funded in this category should demonstrate economic, social, and environmental benefits of IPM strategies and identify constraints to greater adoption of IPM systems by users.

Following are the budget limits for Research projects. The maximum budget for a project depends on whether there are single or multiple states or regions involved. Projects may have a duration of up to three years. **Please note that one- or two-year Research projects may be eligible for no-cost extensions after years one and two, but that no carryover or extension is permitted for these projects beyond three years. Any unexpended funds are lost.**

Single state in the Northeast: Research applications with PDs from single or multiple institutions in only one state may have a maximum total project budget of \$60,000.

Single state, multi-region: If PDs from only one northeastern state are involved with an institution outside the Northeast, project limits are \$60,000.

Multi-state, single region: Research applications with PDs from more than one state in the Northeast may have a maximum total project budget of \$180,000.

Multi-state, multi-region: If PDs from more than one northeastern state are involved with an institution outside the Northeast, project limits are \$180,000.

2. Extension

This funding category enhances outreach efforts that support the wide-scale implementation of IPM methods. Projects should maximize opportunities to build strategic alliances with industry and user groups to expand their active participation in increasing the adoption of IPM methods. You may develop educational materials and information delivery systems needed for outreach efforts, conducting field-scale or on-farm demonstrations, or delivering IPM education and training. A research component is not a required element of Extension projects, but the research base should be documented.

Following are the budget limits for Extension projects. The maximum budget for a project depends on whether there are single or multiple states or regions involved. Projects may have a duration of up to three years.

Single state in the Northeast: Extension applications with PDs from a single or multiple institutions in only one state may have a maximum total project budget of \$50,000.

Single state, multi-region: If PDs from only one northeastern state are involved with an institution outside the Northeast, project limits are \$60,000.

Multi-state, single region: Extension applications with PDs from more than one state in the northeastern region may have a maximum total project budget of \$70,000.

Multi-state, multi-region: If PDs from more than one northeastern state are involved with an institution outside the Northeast, the project limit is \$70,000.

3. Joint Research-Extension

This funding category combines research and extension activities (as described in Parts II.C.1 and 2, above). Joint Research-Extension projects validate pest management systems, introduce new pest management tactics into local production systems, and deliver these systems to producers and their advisors through IPM education and training programs. The project team should include both researchers and extension educators with appointments in research and extension.

Following are the budget limits for Joint Research-Extension projects. The maximum budget for a project depends on whether there are single or multiple states or regions involved. Projects may have a duration of up to three years. **Please note that one- or two-year Joint Research-Extension projects may be eligible for no-cost extensions after years one and two, but that no carryover or extension is permitted for these projects beyond three years. Any unexpended funds are lost.**

Single state in the Northeast: Joint Research-Extension applications with PDs from a single or multiple institutions in only one state may have a maximum total project budget of \$60,000.

Single state, multi-region: If PDs from only one northeastern state are involved with an institution outside the Northeast, the project limit is \$60,000.

Multi-state, single region: Joint Research-Extension applications with PDs from more than one state in the Northeast may have a maximum total project budget of \$175,000.

Multi-state, multi-region: If PDs from more than one northeastern state are involved with an institution outside the Northeast, the project limit is \$175,000.

PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants

Organizations eligible to receive Research awards are: state agricultural experiment stations, land-grant colleges and universities, research foundations established by land-grant colleges and universities, colleges and universities receiving funds under the Act of October 10, 1962 (16 U.S.C. 582a et seq.), and accredited schools or colleges of veterinary medicine. For Research projects, eligible land-grant colleges and universities include all 1862, 1890, and 1994 land-grant institutions. Eligibility for Extension projects is limited to 1862 land-grant colleges and universities. Award recipients may subcontract to organizations not eligible to apply, provided such organizations are necessary for the conduct of the project. An applicant's failure to meet an eligibility criterion by the time of an application deadline will result in CSREES returning the application without review or, even though an application may be reviewed, will preclude CSREES from making an award.

Research and extension personnel from other USDA/IPM regions (North Central, Southern, and Western) and other state and federal organizations can participate as members of project teams, but they cannot serve as sole PDs on a proposal submitted to the NE-IPM Competitive Grants Program; i.e., the primary institution must be from one of the Northeastern Region states or the District of Columbia.

B. Cost Sharing or Matching

There are no matching requirements associated with the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program, and matching resources will not be factored into the review process as evaluation criteria.

PART IV—APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

A. The Application Package

1. If you are a Project Director

DO NOT AUTOMATICALLY REGISTER. Project directors do not need to register with Grants.gov, unless they are authorized to submit an application on behalf of their organization. Applications to this RFA must be submitted electronically to Grants.gov by an Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR). Usually this individual works at a university's Grants and Contracts Office or Office of Sponsored Programs. Prior to preparing an application, contact your AOR to determine if your organization is registered to submit electronic applications through Grants.gov (most qualifying institutions in the Northeast are now registered) and how many days are needed to process your proposal.

To access application materials via Grants.gov, go to https://apply.grants.gov/forms_apps_idx.html and enter the funding opportunity number USDA-CSREES-RIPM-000102.

Note that the Grants.gov application consists of specific forms supplemented by PDF (portable document file) attachments. In order to save a document as a PDF, the applicant will need to use PDF generator software. Grants.gov has published the following web page on tools and software that the applicant can use:

http://www.grants.gov/resources/download_software.jsp#pdf_conversion_programs.

For additional help on applying electronically, see <http://www.csrees.usda.gov/funding/electronic.html> and in particular the CSREES Grants.gov application guide.

2. If you are an Authorized Organizational Representative

Refer to <http://www.grants.gov/GetRegistered> for steps for preparing to submit applications through Grants.gov.) Note, Grants.gov works only with Internet Explorer 5.01 or higher, Netscape Communicator 4.5-4.8, Netscape 6.1, 6.2 or 7.

B. Content and Form of Letter of Intent and Application Submission

Content and Form of Letter of Intent

The letter of intent must not exceed one page and must include the working title of the project, PD(s) and institution(s), likely cooperator(s) and their institution(s), crops and pests addressed, and the project objectives (one or two sentences per objective which can be modified in the application). Details of the final application may vary from those in the letter of intent. **Do not submit a budget with the letter of intent.** The purpose of the letter is to assist in technical review panel identification and recruiting. It will not be used in the application evaluation. It is expected that people submitting a letter of intent will submit a full application. An application

will not be accepted if a letter of intent is not submitted in accordance with the instructions in this RFA.

Content and Form of Application Submission

Electronic applications should be prepared in accordance with the CSREES Grants.gov application guide entitled “[A Guide for Preparation and Submission of CSREES Applications via Grants.gov](#).” This guide is part of the corresponding application package (see Section A above). The following is **additional information** needed in order to prepare an application in response to this RFA.

1. R&R Cover Sheet.

a. Estimated Project Funding (Field 16 on the Form).

Accurately include the amount requested from Research funds (P.L. 89-106) and/or Extension funds (Smith-Lever 3(d)).

2. R&R Other Project Information Form.

a. Project Summary/Abstract (Field 6 on the Form). It must be attached as a PDF document and have the following parts:

(i) Project Type (choose one): Research; Extension; or Joint Research-Extension.

(ii) Summary Statement. The first line of your summary should state the type of project you are submitting, for example, “This is a Research project” or “This is an Extension project.” For Joint Research-Extension projects, the summary statement must indicate how many dollars are being requested from each respective source (Smith-Lever funds are for extension, and P.L. 89-106 funds are for research). The summary should be a self-contained, specific description of the activity to be undertaken and should focus on: overall project goal(s) and supporting objectives; plans to accomplish project goal(s); and relevance of the project to the priorities of the Northeastern IPM Center (see Part I.B. 1-3).

b. Project Narrative (Field 7 on the Form).

In this section, describe the need for your project; your goals and how you will achieve them; and how you (and the Northeastern IPM Center) will know you have succeeded.

Page limits for this section: Subsections (i) through (iii), combined, 15 pages. Subsection (iv), three pages.

Include all of the following in the Project Description:

(i) **Problem, Background and Justification**

- **Problem:** Describe, in simple terms, the problem. Consider including the economic importance of the crop or problem, the importance of the pest(s), and the reason for your study (e.g., conventional pest-control strategies no longer work; beneficial insects are being harmed by available pest-control options; there is a lack of training or implementation of new IPM tactics).
- **Background:** Address the specific need(s) identified by growers and other stakeholders in the Northeastern Region. Cite at least one needs-assessment evaluation used to formulate your project. (See http://northeastipm.org/regu_regional.cfm for IPM Working Group priorities, stakeholder group recommendations, the 1995 statewide needs assessment database, or other documented needs-assessment evaluations.) Demonstrate that you are engaged with constituents on some level and that your project addresses their needs.

Review ongoing or completed work (local/regional/national) that is relevant to your project, and include references. Describe how previous work funded by the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program or other sources might contribute to the proposed project.

- **Justification:** Specify who in the Northeast Region stands to benefit from your project. Consider environmental, health, or economic benefits. If it strengthens your case, choose one or two real people from your target audience as examples, name them, and describe in a few words their predicament.

Describe why current technologies and practices are inadequate, or explain how the proposed approach will (1) help to improve or implement existing pest management systems and (2) address the specific needs identified in this solicitation. To assist you in writing this section, try answering the question, “Without intervention (or without my project), the following might happen:_____.”

Tell us about the potential applicability of the proposed approach to other production regions and the relevance of the project to the priorities of the Northeastern IPM Center (see Part I.B.1-3 of this RFA).

(ii) **Objectives and Anticipated Impacts.** Provide clear, concise, and logically numbered statement(s) of the specific aims of the proposed effort. *If you are writing a Joint Research-Extension proposal, please separate the research and extension objectives.*

Then describe the anticipated impacts that could be associated with the fulfillment of your objectives (you may do this in list or table format). Both your objectives and your impacts should connect to the goals of the Northeastern IPM Center: encouraging science-based pest management that safeguards human health and the environment; promoting economic benefits; and furthering the implementation of IPM.

Ideally, the stated project impacts will refer to *measurable* changes that can be substantiated by *data analysis*, as indicated in Part IV.B.2(b.iv.), Evaluation Plans, below. Your plan for verifying that these impacts have been achieved will significantly strengthen your application.

The following table poses questions that may help you identify appropriate types of impacts:

Type of Impact	Questions to Help Identify Potential Impacts
<i>Safeguarding human health and the environment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Could new IPM practices be adopted as a direct result of your project and the total number of acres (or homes, schools, greenhouses, nurseries) on which these practices could be implemented? b. Could the project reduce risk by changing the use of pesticides on farms, or in homes, schools, etc.? For example, could it result in fewer sprays per season or a switch to lower-risk pesticides? (Since there is no unanimous definition of high and low risk, investigators selecting this indicator are asked to categorize the pesticides they are reporting on as high or low risk according to the particular situation, such as lower risk to natural enemies).
<i>Economic benefits</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What could be the economic benefit (e.g., dollars saved) for clientele who adopt IPM strategies and systems you studied? Do you envision potential commercialization or mass production of these systems? b. How many IPM personnel might be employed as a result of your work (e.g., private consulting services, nursery operators, food service growers)? c. How many clients do you anticipate would be satisfied with IPM results (such as improved yield, quality of yield, reduced pest populations, more effective pest control, and greater preservation of nonpest species)? d. Are there other financial benefits that might be realized as a result of your project?
<i>Implementation of IPM</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How many IPM strategies and systems will be validated through this project (e.g., through on-farm trials, large plot tests, or other methods used to confirm efficacy)? b. How many educational materials will be delivered? To whom? c. How many growers/personnel will be trained? d. For a website, what volume of traffic and type of use will the site experience? (For example, # visitors per day/month; # page views; # of unique user sessions; change in volume during growing season; average viewing time.) e. How many more people might adopt IPM practices as a direct result of your project, or how many people might adopt new IPM practices? f. Are there other ways in which your work will result in improved use or increased implementation of IPM strategies in your region or across the Northeast? g. How could your project or study enhance collaboration among stakeholders interested in the development and implementation of improved IPM strategies and systems? (For example, number of growers or other types of stakeholders that have participated in advisory committees, surveys.)

- (iii) **Approach and Procedures.** Describe how each of the stated objectives will be reached, in the same order as listed above in Part IV.B.2(b.ii.). Include:
- appropriate experimental design and experimental units;
 - methods to be used (reference these);
 - appropriate statistical analysis.

Construct a timetable for the start and completion of each phase of the project. (Columns might read “Objective / Phase / Tasks / Complete by...”.) For a Joint Research-Extension application, describe how the project will be managed, particularly how coordination between research and extension components will be achieved and maintained. The degree of collaboration should be specifically addressed for multi-disciplinary, multi-organizational, and multi-state collaboration, respectively. If collaboration in any of these three aspects does not apply, state why.

- (iv) **Evaluation Plans.** In this section, describe how you will verify that the anticipated impacts associated with your project objectives have occurred (or how you will measure the extent to which they have occurred).
- (1) **Research Projects:** Provide detailed plans for evaluation of the project, indicating how you will determine whether the anticipated impacts stated in Part IV.B.2(b.ii.), above, have been achieved. If measurement of these anticipated impacts will not be possible in the context of the proposed project, describe how the tactic or system you studied, once developed, might be incorporated into an existing crop management program on a large scale.
 - (2) **Extension Projects and Joint Research-Extension Projects:** Provide detailed plans for evaluation of the project. The evaluation plan should include specific evaluation objectives and indicators (e.g., adoption rate, number of acres impacted, pesticide use, risk reduction, profitability) that will be used to measure impacts and outcomes resulting from the project. Evaluation plans that include surveys should indicate survey expertise of investigators and/or describe the survey methodology that will be used.

The Evaluation Plans portion of the application should not exceed three pages in length.

c. Other Attachments (Field 11 on the Form); all must be PDFs. Name them according to the names shown here.

- (i) **Relevance Statement.** A three-page statement should be included that describes the relevance of the project to the priorities discussed in Part I.B. The Relevance Statement is the only part of the submission that will be viewed by the Relevance Review Panel. Conversely, it is the only part of the submission that the Technical Review Panel will not see.

The Relevance Statement should contain, in this order:

- (a) Names and institutions of PDs and major cooperators;
- (b) Project title;

- (c) Project type (choose one): Research; Extension; or Joint Research-Extension;
- (d) Project summary (see Part IV.B.2a), above; this may be copied directly from the application; it should not exceed one page in length);
- (e) Description of the problem, background, and justification; and (You may copy this section from the application, as long you do not exceed the total 3-page limit for the entire Relevance Statement. Be sure to address all three types of priorities outlined in Part I.B of this RFA).

- Indicate how your project addresses stakeholder-identified priorities; cite at least one source (see Part I.B); demonstrate that you are engaged with constituents, on some level, in regard to their priorities;
- Indicate how the project develops, promotes, or implements nonpesticidal tactics;
- Discuss the level of multi-state involvement in the project and potential multi-state impacts resulting from the project;
- Discuss the problem in terms of environmental stewardship and risk management, importance of the crop or setting regionally, and importance of the pest(s) within the setting; and
- Discuss the probability of project results being widely implemented.

- (f) Project objectives and anticipated outcomes. Do not exceed one page for this section of the Relevance Statement. Follow the guidelines provided in Part IV.B.2(b.ii.) above.

You do not need to include a list of references, letters of support, budget, or other forms with the Relevance Statement.

(ii) **Collaborative Arrangements** (attached as PDFs). Formal consulting or collaborative arrangements with others should be fully explained and justified. If the consultant(s) or collaborator(s) are known at the time of application, vitae or resume should be provided. In addition, evidence (e.g., letter of support) should be provided that the collaborators involved have agreed to render these services. The applicant also will be required to provide additional information on consultants and collaborators in the budget portion of the application.

(iii) **Appendices to Project Narrative.** Appendices to the Project Narrative are allowed if they are directly germane to the proposed project. The addition of appendices should not be used to circumvent the text and/or figures and tables page limitations.

3. Budget.

Please note that indirect costs and tuition are not allowed. For further information, see Part IV.D.

a. A budget form is required for each year of requested support and another summing the requested support over all requested years. The R&R Subaward Budget Attachment described in section 6.1 of “[A Guide for Preparation and Submission of CSREES Applications via Grants.gov](#)” should be utilized to provide the information. Funds may be requested under any of the categories listed on the form, provided that the item or service for which support is requested

is allowable under the authorizing legislation, the applicable statutes, regulations, and Federal cost principles, and these program guidelines, and can be justified as necessary for the successful conduct of the proposed project.

The project budget should include expenses for one PD to attend an annual meeting of NEREAP-IPM for purposes of delivering an oral report.

b. Budget Justification (Field K on the form; attach as a PDF)

Joint Research-Extension projects must show the proposed breakdown of amounts requested from P.L. 89-106 funds (Research) and Smith-Lever funds (Extension) for each year of funding being requested. Include cumulative project costs over all years, by cost category and funding source (Research and/or Extension). An example of a form that may be used for this purpose is available at http://northeastipm.org/grants_ripm_extras.cfm.

For any subcontractors the budget justification must include a summary budget and a budget for each year as well as a budget justification (with the same detail as required for the grantee budget).

4. Supplemental Information Form.

a. Program to which you are applying (Field 2 on the Form). Enter the program code name **“Northeastern IPM”** and the program code **QQ.NE**. It is critical for the routing of this application that the program code be entered exactly as stated or the application may not be routed to the intended program.

C. Submission Dates and Times

Letters of intent to submit an application must be received by John Ayers, the NE-IPM Grants Manager, by COB on October 6, 2006 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time). *An application will not be accepted if a letter of intent was not submitted in accordance with instructions in this RFA.* Applications must be received by Grants.gov by COB on November 17, 2006 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time). Applications received after this deadline will normally not be considered for funding.

D. Funding Restrictions

CSREES has determined that grant funds awarded under this authority may not be used for the renovation or refurbishment of research, education, or extension space; the purchase or installation of fixed equipment in such space; or the planning, repair, rehabilitation, acquisition, or construction of buildings or facilities.

Pursuant to Section 1473 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1997 (91 Stat. 981), indirect costs and tuition remission are unallowable costs under Section 2(c)(1)(B) projects and Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever funded projects, and no funds will be approved for this purpose. Costs that are a part of the institution's indirect cost pool may not be reclassified as direct costs for the purpose of making them allowable.

E. Other Submission Requirements

1. What to Submit

Letter of Intent: E-mail, fax, or paper letter are all acceptable. One page maximum.

2. Where to Submit

Letters of Intent: Submit to Dr. John E. Ayers, via e-mail (jea@psu.edu), fax (814) 863-8175, or U.S. mail (The Pennsylvania State University, 114 Buckhout Laboratory, University Park, PA 16802).

Applications: Applications will be submitted to CSREES through Grants.gov. The applicant should follow the submission requirements noted in the document entitled “[A Guide for Preparation and Submission of CSREES Applications via Grants.gov.](#)”

PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

A. General

Subsection (c)(5) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)), as amended by Section 212 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)(5)) requires grantees to arrange for scientific peer review of their proposed research activities and merit review of their proposed extension and education activities in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary prior to the Secretary making a grant award under this authority. The application review process conducted by the Northeastern IPM Center fulfills the scientific peer review and merit review requirements. Additional reviews by the submitting institutions are not necessary.

B. Evaluation Criteria

Application review will be handled at the regional level using a two-part process. The Relevance Panel (Merit Review) will use only the Relevance Statement to review project relevance to regional priorities. The Technical Panel will use applications, but not Relevance Statements, to review project technical merit and feasibility. Successful applications must be strong in both areas. To be funded, an application must meet minimum standards set by both panels. The Grants Manager will combine results of both reviews and present the results to a committee of Extension and Experiment Station Directors from the Northeastern Region. The committee will use this information to recommend project funding, including level and duration, to CSREES. Paragraphs 1 and 2, below, delineate the review criteria.

1. Relevance Review

Only the Relevance Statement (described in Part IV.B.2.c.(i)) will be used to determine a proposed project's relevance to program priorities. The panel will consist of approximately ten reviewers from within the Northeastern Region representing diverse perspectives, including production; consultants; environmental advocacy; consumer advocacy; public and private sector; research and extension; and traditional pest management disciplines.

The criteria for the Relevance Review Panel for Research, Extension, and Joint Research-Extension projects are shown here. For more details, see Part II.C.1-3.

Relevance Rating Criteria	Possible Points
The Relevance Statement follows the guidelines in the RFA <div style="text-align: right;"><u>Maximum score</u></div> Three pages, maximum 5 Proper format (name, title, project type, summary, description, objectives/outcomes) 5	10
Explicit link established to stakeholder-identified need, including the identification (by group, not by name) of stakeholders who expressed the need. <div style="text-align: right;"><u>Maximum score</u></div> No mention of stakeholders in setting the priority 0 Mention of stakeholders but no documentation 5 Clearly documented as priority of an important stakeholder group 10 Clearly documented as an important priority by multiple stakeholder groups 15	15
Project focuses on development, promotion, or implementation of nonpesticidal tactics. <div style="text-align: right;"><u>Maximum Score</u></div> Will not impact risk in any way 0 Has pesticide management focus and could significantly reduce or improve risk 7 Focused on interdisciplinary, nonpesticidal tactics and could significantly reduce or improve risk 15	15
High level of multi-state involvement within the Northeastern Region. <div style="text-align: right;"><u>Maximum score</u></div> Only one state involved and only one state would benefit 0 Only one state involved but several may benefit 5 More than one state involved and several states will clearly benefit 10 ---- <i>For projects with budgets of \$20,000 or less:</i> <i>Only one state involved and only one would benefit</i> 3 <i>Only one state involved but several will benefit</i> 10	10
Project addresses the Northeastern Region's priorities (see Part I.B for more detail). <div style="text-align: right;"><u>Maximum score</u></div> Environmental stewardship and risk management 15 Importance and value of the crop system, or urban/suburban setting, to region 10 Importance, or potential importance, of the pest to the setting or crop system 10 Potential for implementation 15 ----	50
Total possible points for Relevance Review:	100

2. Technical Review

A technical panel will review, evaluate, score and rank the applications for technical merit. The panel will consist of research and extension personnel from outside the Northeastern Region, representing each of the appropriate major pest disciplines.

The criteria used in the Technical Review of Research, Extension, and Joint Research-Extension projects are shown here. For more details, see Part II.C.1-3.

Technical Rating Criteria	Possible Points
Appropriate objectives, design, and methodology; clear scientific value (approximately 6 points each) ___ Does the application follow all guidelines specified in this RFA? ___ Is the problem well presented and the literature review adequate? ___ Do the objectives address the problem presented? ___ Is the project innovative? ___ Are the anticipated impacts well matched to the objectives? ___ Will the project make a significant contribution to new knowledge or provide a better understanding of existing knowledge? ___ Are the approach, procedures, and methods appropriate and sufficient to accomplish the stated objectives? ___ Is the probability of success high? ___ Can the objectives be accomplished in the stated time frame? ___ Does the project, as proposed, duplicate ongoing projects at other institutions?	60
Appropriate budget, including a self-explanatory budget narrative	10
Professional competence of the project team	10
Degree of interdisciplinary or multi-institutional collaboration <i>(or appropriate justification for lack of interdisciplinary or multi-institutional collaboration. Note that projects with budgets of \$20,000 or less may show benefits to the Northeast instead of multi-institutional collaborations.)</i>	10
For Research Projects: Appropriate implementation plan with anticipated impacts (clearly defined deliverables that will strengthen the scientific community, worth 10 points) —OR— For Extension and Joint Research/Extension Projects: Appropriate strategy/process to evaluate when, and to what extent, the anticipated impacts will have occurred in the targeted audience—that is, the success of the project (worth 10 points)	10
Total possible points for Technical Review	100

C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality

During the peer evaluation process, extreme care will be taken to prevent any actual or perceived conflicts of interest that may impact review or evaluation. For the purpose of determining conflicts of interest, the academic and administrative autonomy of an institution shall be determined by reference to the current Higher Education Directory, published by Higher

Education Publications, Inc., 6400 Arlington Boulevard, Suite 648, Falls Church, Virginia 22042. Phone: (703) 532-2300. Website: <http://www.hepinc.com>.

Names of submitting institutions and individuals, as well as application content and peer evaluations, will be kept confidential, except to those involved in the review process, to the extent permitted by law. In addition, the identities of peer reviewers will remain confidential throughout the entire review process. Therefore, the names of the reviewers will not be released to applicants.

D. Organizational Management Information

Specific management information relating to an applicant shall be submitted on a one-time basis as part of the responsibility determination prior to the award of a grant identified under this RFA, if such information has not been provided previously under this or another CSREES program. CSREES will provide copies of forms recommended for use in fulfilling these requirements as part of the pre-award process. Although an applicant may be eligible based on its status as one of these entities, there are factors that may exclude an applicant from receiving Federal financial and nonfinancial assistance and benefits under this program (e.g., debarment or suspension of an individual involved or a determination that an applicant is not responsible based on submitted organizational management information).

PART VI—AWARD ADMINISTRATION

A. General

Within the limit of funds available for such purpose, the awarding official of CSREES shall make grants to those responsible, eligible applicants whose applications are judged most meritorious under the procedures set forth in this RFA. The date specified by the awarding official of CSREES as the effective date of the grant shall be no later than September 30 of the Federal fiscal year in which the project is approved for support and funds are appropriated for such purpose, unless otherwise permitted by law. It should be noted that the project need not be initiated on the grant effective date, but as soon thereafter as practical so project goals may be attained within the funded project period. All funds granted by CSREES under this RFA shall be expended solely for the purpose for which the funds are granted in accordance with the approved application and budget, the regulations, the terms and conditions of the award, the applicable Federal cost principles, and the Department's assistance regulations (parts 3015 and 3019 of 7 CFR). **NOTE: Beginning in fiscal year 2007 CRIS Forms AD-416 “Research Work Unit/Project Description-Research Resume” and AD-417 “Research Work Unit/Project Description-Classification of Research,” will apply to both the P.L. 89-106 and Smith-Lever 3(d) funds and will be requested if an application is identified for funding.**

B. Award Notice

The grant award document shall include at a minimum the following:

- (1) Legal name and address of performing organization or institution to whom the Administrator has awarded a grant under the terms of this request for applications;
- (2) Title of project;
- (3) Name(s) and institution(s) of PDs chosen to direct and control approved activities;
- (4) Identifying grant number assigned by the Department;
- (5) Project period, specifying the amount of time the Department intends to support the project without requiring recompetition for funds;
- (6) Total amount of Departmental financial assistance approved by the Administrator during the project period;
- (7) Legal authority(ies) under which the grant is awarded;
- (8) Appropriate Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number;
- (9) Applicable award terms and conditions (see <http://www.csrees.usda.gov/business/awards/awardterms.html> to review CSREES award terms and conditions);

(10) Approved budget plan for categorizing allocable project funds to accomplish the stated purpose of the grant award; and

(11) Other information or provisions deemed necessary by CSREES to carry out its respective granting activities or to accomplish the purpose of a particular grant.

C. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

Several Federal statutes and regulations apply to grant applications considered for review and to project grants awarded under this program. These include, but are not limited to:

7 CFR Part 1, subpart A—USDA implementation of the Freedom of Information Act.

7 CFR Part 3—USDA implementation of OMB Circular No. A-129 regarding debt collection.

7 CFR Part 15, subpart A—USDA implementation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended.

7 CFR Part 331 and 9 CFR Part 121—USDA implementation of the Agricultural Bioterrorism Protection Act of 2002.

7 CFR Part 3015—USDA Uniform Federal Assistance Regulations, implementing OMB directives (i.e., OMB Circular Nos. A-21 and A-122) and incorporating provisions of 31 U.S.C. 6301-6308 (formerly the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977, Pub. L. No. 95-224), as well as general policy requirements applicable to recipients of Departmental financial assistance.

7 CFR Part 3017—USDA implementation of Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants).

7 CFR Part 3018—USDA implementation of Restrictions on Lobbying. Imposes prohibitions and requirements for disclosure and certification related to lobbying on recipients of Federal contracts, grants, cooperative agreements, and loans.

7 CFR Part 3019—USDA implementation of OMB Circular A-110, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Other Agreements With Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Nonprofit Organizations.

7 CFR Part 3052—USDA implementation of OMB Circular No. A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-profit Organizations.

7 CFR Part 3407—CSREES procedures to implement the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

29 U.S.C. 794 (section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973) and 7 CFR Part 15b (USDA implementation of statute)—prohibiting discrimination based upon physical or mental handicap in Federally assisted programs.

35 U.S.C. 200 et seq.—Bayh-Dole Act, controlling allocation of rights to inventions made by employees of small business firms and domestic nonprofit organizations, including universities, in Federally assisted programs (implementing regulations are contained in 37 CFR Part 401).

D. Expected Program Outputs and Reporting Requirements

In addition to the reporting requirements identified in CSREES “Terms and Conditions” (which is provided to successful applicants as part of the award package), successful applicants will be required to submit a detailed yearly progress report and, upon completion of the project, a final technical report to the Grants Manager.

Progress reports for the NE-IPM Competitive Grants Program should be 1-2 pages (12-point type or larger, one-inch margins). In the report, the PD will be expected to demonstrate that progress has been made on the project; to highlight important findings and recommendations made as a result of the project progress to date; to fully describe changes in objectives, procedures, and the timetable for completion of the project; etc. Failure to submit a progress report will result in a recommendation to CSREES to reduce or terminate funding. The Grants Manager will contact the PD at the time the report is due, approximately one year after the grant starting date.

PDs are required to acknowledge CSREES and the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program – Northeastern Region in all publications or other products that result from funds that are awarded. Reprints or copies of all publications would be appreciated.

Final reports will be due 90 days after the project termination date. Final reports must be comprehensive and should include more data, figures, etc., than normally would occur in a typical refereed publication or extension publication. For specifics on the reporting requirements, see http://northeastipm.org/ripm_reporting_requirements.cfm.

PART VII—PROGRAM CONTACT

Applicants and other interested parties are encouraged to contact the Grants Manager:

Dr. John E. Ayers
Co-Director Northeastern IPM Center
The Pennsylvania State University
114 Buckhout Laboratory
University Park, PA 16802
Telephone: (814) 865-7776
Fax: (814) 863-8175
E-mail: jea@psu.edu

PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION

A. Access to Review Information

Copies of reviews, not including the identity of reviewers, and a summary of the panel comments will be sent to the applicant PD after the review process has been completed.

B. Use of Funds; Changes

1. Delegation of Fiscal Responsibility

Unless the terms and conditions of the grant state otherwise, the grantee may not in whole or in part delegate or transfer to another person, institution, or organization the responsibility for use or expenditure of grant funds.

2. Changes in Project Plans

(a) The permissible changes by the grantee, PD(s), or other key project personnel in the approved project grant shall be limited to changes in methodology, techniques, or other similar aspects of the project to expedite achievement of the project's approved goals. If the grantee or the PD(s) is uncertain as to whether a change complies with this provision, the question must be referred to the Authorized Departmental Officer (ADO) for a final determination. The ADO is the signatory of the award document, not the program contact.

(b) Changes in approved goals or objectives shall be requested by the grantee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such changes. In no event shall requests for such changes be approved which are outside the scope of the original approved project.

(c) Changes in approved project leadership or the replacement or reassignment of other key project personnel shall be requested by the grantee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such changes.

(d) Transfers of actual performance of the substantive programmatic work in whole or in part and provisions for payment of funds, whether or not Federal funds are involved, shall be requested by the grantee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such transfers, unless prescribed otherwise in the terms and conditions of the grant.

(e) The project period may be extended by CSREES without additional financial support, for such additional period(s) as the ADO determines may be necessary to complete or fulfill the purposes of an approved project, but in no case shall the total project period exceed three years for Research projects; five years for Extension projects; and three years for Joint Research-Extension projects as indicated in the terms and conditions. Any extension of time shall be conditioned upon prior request by the grantee and approval in writing by the ADO, unless prescribed otherwise in the terms and conditions of a grant. **Research and Joint Research-Extension projects (funded from P.L. 89-106) cannot be extended beyond the third year. Project periods should be sufficient to achieve objectives without exceeding**

three (3) years. PDs of three-year projects are advised to use available funds prior to the termination of the award.

(f) Changes in an approved budget must be requested by the grantee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to instituting such changes if the revision will involve transfers or expenditures of amounts requiring prior approval as set forth in the applicable Federal cost principles, Departmental regulations, or grant award.

C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards

When an application results in a grant, it becomes a part of the record of CSREES transactions, available to the public upon specific request. Information that the Secretary determines to be of a confidential, privileged, or proprietary nature will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law. Therefore, any information that the applicant wishes to have considered as confidential, privileged or proprietary should be clearly marked within the application. The original copy of an application that does not result in a grant will be retained by the Agency for a period of three years. Other copies will be destroyed. Such an application will be released only with the consent of the applicant or to the extent required by law. An application may be withdrawn at any time prior to the final action thereon.

D. Regulatory Information

For the reasons set forth in the final Rule-related Notice to 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V (48 FR 29114, June 24, 1983), this program is excluded from the scope of the Executive Order 12372 which requires intergovernmental consultation with state and local officials. Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), the collection of information requirements contained in this Notice have been approved under OMB Document No. 0524-0039.

E. Definitions

For the purpose of this program, the following definitions are applicable:

Administrator means the Administrator of CSREES and any other officer or employee of the Department to whom the authority involved is delegated.

Authorized departmental officer means the Secretary or any employee of the Department who has the authority to issue or modify grant instruments on behalf of the Secretary.

Authorized organizational representative means the president, director, or chief executive officer or other designated official of the applicant organization who has the authority to commit the resources of the organization.

Budget period means the interval of time (usually 12 months) into which the project period is divided for budgetary and reporting purposes.

Cash contributions means the applicant's cash outlay, including the outlay of money contributed to the applicant by non-Federal third parties.

Department or USDA means the United States Department of Agriculture.

Grant means the award by the Secretary of funds to an eligible organization or individual to assist in meeting the costs of conducting, for the benefit of the public, an identified project which is intended and designed to accomplish the purpose of the program as identified in these guidelines.

Grantee means the organization designated in the grant award document as the responsible legal entity to which a grant is awarded.

Peer reviewers means experts or consultants qualified by training and experience in particular field of science, education, or technology to give expert advice on the scientific and technical merit of grant applications on the relevance of those applications to one or more of the application evaluation criteria. Peer reviewers may be ad hoc or convened as a panel.

Prior approval means written approval evidencing prior consent by an authorized departmental officer.

Project means the particular activity within the scope of the program supported by a grant award.

Project director (PD) means the single individual designated by the grantee in the grant application and approved by the Secretary who is responsible for the direction and management of the project.

Project period means the period, as stated in the award document, during which Federal sponsorship begins and ends.

Secretary means the Secretary of Agriculture and any other officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture to whom the authority involved is delegated.

USDA means the United States Department of Agriculture.

F. CSREES' Grants.gov Implementation Plans

CSREES is continuing to develop its capacity to exchange proposal and grant data electronically with its grantees through [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) and to process, review, and award proposals and grants electronically.

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2006, CSREES offered an electronic application option for select grant programs and partnered with five institutions to use Grants.gov Apply. CSREES utilized the SF-424 R&R (Research and Related) forms package (see 70 FR 9656, published in the Federal Register on February 28, 2005) along with CSREES Agency-specific forms and instructions to

receive the electronic applications. These pilot activities were successful and provided lessons for applicants and CSREES.

As a result, for the FY 2007 (October 1, 2006-September 30, 2007) cycle, CSREES is requiring electronic submission through Grants.gov for some programs while providing a Grants.gov option for others. Please visit <http://www.csrees.usda.gov/funding/fy07changes.html> for information about FY 2007 submission requirements by program. For more information about CSREES' Grants.gov plans, including important announcements, program implementation, and detailed requirements, see the CSREES' web site, http://www.csrees.usda.gov/business/other_links/egov/egov.html. The information on these web sites will be updated as appropriate. It is suggested that the sites be visited periodically for important updates.

G. DUNS Number

A Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number is a unique nine-digit sequence recognized as the universal standard for identifying and keeping track of over 70 million businesses worldwide. A Federal Register notice of final policy issuance (68 FR 38402) requires a DUNS number in every application (i.e., hard copy and electronic) for a grant or cooperative agreement (except applications from individuals) submitted on or after October 1, 2003. Therefore, potential applicants to this RFA should obtain the DUNS number from their authorized organizational representative. They should not ask for or create a separate DUNS number.

AORs can obtain information about how to obtain a DUNS number from <http://www.grants.gov/RequestaDUNS>. Please note that the registration may take up to 14 business days to complete.

H. Required Registration for Grants.gov

The Central Contract Registry (CCR) is a database that serves as the primary Government repository for contractor information required for the conduct of business with the Government. This database will also be used as a central location for maintaining organizational information for organizations seeking and receiving grants from the Government. Such organizations must register in the CCR prior to the submission of applications via grants.gov (a DUNS number is needed for CCR registration). For information about how to register in the CCR visit "Get Registered" in the website, <http://www.grants.gov>. Allow a minimum of 5 days to complete the CCR registration.